

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,853,863 to Carter et al. (*Carter*) in view of Bioelectromagnetics 18:2-7, 1997 by Li et al. (*Li*) and U.S. Patent No. 5,088,981 to Howson et al. (*Howson*). Claim 2 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,663 to Schroepel et al. (*Schroepel*), U.S. Patent No. 6,574,507 to Bonnet et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,892,086 to Russell et al. (*Russell*). Claim 4 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of *Schroepel*. Claim 5 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of *Russell* and U.S. Patent No. 6,161,048 to Sluijter et al. (*Sluijter*). Claim 6 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and further in view of *Russell* and U.S. Patent No. 6,235,024 to Tu. Claim 7 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,462 to Tanouye et al. Claim 8 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,919,168 to Hwang et al. Claim 10 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,638,277 to Schaefer et al. Claim 11 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of *Sluijter*. Claim 12 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,861,002 to Desai. Claim 13 was rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson* and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,765,471 to Hill et al. Claims 15 and 16 were rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over *Carter* in view of *Li* and *Howson*.

The Examiner found patentable subject matter in claims 3 and 14 and stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in suitable independent form.

Applicants' Reply

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 14.

Applicants have now rewritten claim 3 in independent form by amending claim 1 to include the requirements of claim 3. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is now allowable. Applicants also submit that the § 103 rejection of claim 1 is moot in light of the amendment.

Applicants have amended claim 2 so that it is consistent with amended claim 1.

Applicants have canceled claim 3.

Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4-16 depend on claim 1 and are patentable over the prior art for the same reasons as claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of which are respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues to be resolved, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner kindly contact the undersigned attorney for early resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: 

Neil P. Sirota

Patent Office Reg. No. 38,306

30 Rockefeller Plaza

44th Floor

New York, NY 10012-4498

Attorney for Applicants

212-408-2500